Remarks

In the non-final Office Action dated November 28, 2008, claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending, and claims 1-6 and 8-13 stand rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8-11 in this Response. The Applicants traverse the rejections set forth by the Examiner.

35 USC § 101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 8-13 under 35 USC § 101, suggesting that the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants have amended claims 8-11, and submit that claims 8-13 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 USC § 101.

35 USC § 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 8-13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0252319 (Gorp) in view of US Patent Number 6,236,450 (Ogura). The Applicants submit that the art cited by the Examiner does not render claims 1-6 and 8-13 obvious.

Claim 1 recites a method of reprinting at least one page of a printed document. According to the method, a printer prints a print job to generate a printed document. A determination is made that at least one page of the printed document includes an error. A user is instructed to load the printed document into an inserter tray on the printer. Each page of the printed document is processed from the inserter tray on the printer to an output tray on the printer by determining if the page includes the error. If the page includes the error, then discarding the page, reprinting the page from the print job to generate a new page, and sending the new page to the output tray. If the page does not include the error, then sending the page to the output tray.

First, the Applicants submit that neither Gorp nor Ogura teach or reasonably suggest the limitation of "processing each page of the printed document from the inserter tray on the printer to an output tray on the printer by: determining if the page includes the error" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner states that Gorp does not teach this limitation, and the Applicants agree. The Examiner asserts that Ogura teaches this limitation, and the Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ogura discloses a copier with an automatic document feeder. A document placed in a document tray is fed one sheet at a time across a document table to a discharge tray. The

document table images the pages, generates copies, and sends the copies to a stacker tray. While pages are being fed from the document tray to the discharge tray, a counter keeps track of the number of pages copied. If a document being copied jams in the automatic feeder mechanism, a user is instructed to re-set the entire document on the document tray. The document pages are then sent from the document tray to the discharge tray without making copies until the counter value is again reached. When the counter value previously determined is reached, the copier again begins the copy process for the remaining pages in the document (Abstract). Ogura does not teach or suggest printing a print job. The Applicants submit that Ogura does not determine if a page includes an error on the page. Instead, an analog alignment sensor 205 is used to measure pages as they pass by the sensor. The sensor measures "on" when the page is present and "off" when the page is absent. Thus, when a page jams in the feed mechanism, the sensor remains "on". In Ogura, the sensor is not operable to determine errors "on the page" because the sensor only detects the presence or absence of the page using "on" or "off" information.

Second, the Applicants submit that neither Gorp nor Ogura teach or reasonably suggest the limitation of "processing each page of the printed document from the inserter tray on the printer to an output tray on the printer by: if the page includes the error, then discarding the page, reprinting the page from the print job to generate a new page, and sending the new page to the output tray" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner states that Gorp does not teach this limitation, and the Applicants agree. The Examiner asserts that Ogura teaches this limitation, and the Applicants respectfully disagree.

Ogura discloses that after the previously jammed page is reached while feeding pages from the document tray to the discharge tray (Column 9, lines 39-43; recovery counter equals document counter), subsequent pages are fed and copied normally (Column 9, lines 50-52). In Ogura, the copy process transfers the document to the discharge tray and places the copies of the document in a stacker tray (Column 8, lines 36-39). In Ogura, the previously jammed page is not discarded. Instead, it is placed on the discharge tray along with all the other pages from the document. That is, while the copier may make copies of some pages of the document and not other, each page of the document is fed from the document tray to the discharge tray. Ogura does not alter the path of the document through the system. For example, Ogura does not disclose that some pages of the document are fed from the document tray to a tray other than the discharge tray. In Ogura, each page of the document is sent to the discharge tray. In some cases,

copies are made from a page as it crosses a document table between the document tray to the discharge tray. In other cases, the page is not copied as it crosses the document table. In each case, however, the document is processed from the document tray to the discharge tray. In addition, the previously jammed page is not reprinted from a print job. Instead, Ogura discloses that the page is copied and sent to the stacker tray. In fact, Ogura does not teach or suggest printing a print job.

Third, the Applicants submit that neither Gorp nor Ogura teach or reasonably suggest the limitation of "processing each page of the printed document from the inserter tray on the printer to an output tray on the printer by: if the page does not include the error, then sending the page to the output tray" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner states that Gorp does not teach this limitation, and the Applicants agree. The Examiner asserts that Ogura teaches this limitation, and the Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, each page from the document is fed from the document tray to the discharge tray, regardless of whether a paper jam is indicated for the individual page. Thus, Ogura is not operable to send some pages of the document to the stacker tray and some pages of the document to the discharge tray. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner has obviously assigned both the discharge tray and the stacker tray in Ogura the same functionality as the "output tray" recited in claim 1. In fact, Ogura is not operable to alter the path of the document through the system.

The Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is non-obvious for at least the reasons provided. Similar arguments apply for independent claim 8. Dependent claims 2-6 and 9-13 are non-obvious for at least depending on base claims 1 and 8.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-6 and 8-13 are non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above, and respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-6 and 8-13.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>Date: February 23, 2009</u>

_____/Sean J. Varley/_____
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
Telephone: (303) 786-7687
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691
Customer No.: 50441